arXiv:1701.03159v1 [stat.AP] 26 Dec 2016

On the Implications of Prior Distribution and Asymptotic Independence Assumptions over the True and Sample Correlations under Bayesian Modeling.

Royi Jacobovic*†

Abstract: The prediction of cancer prognosis and metastatic potential immediately after the initial diagnoses is a major challenge in current clinical research. The relevance of such a signature is clear, as it will free many patients from the agony and toxic side-effects associated with the adjuvant chemotherapy automatically and sometimes carelessly subscribed to them. Motivated by this issue, Ein-Dor, Zuk and Domany [Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 15(103):5923-5928 (2006)] presented a statistical model which states that thousands of samples are needed to generate a robust gene-list for predicting outcome. Their model assumptions are done over the joint distribution of the sample correlations of the genes with the survival status. This work is devoted to the implications of these assumptions on the joint distribution of the data. In particular it is shown that sparsity or Gaussianity assumptions over the joint distribution of the data are inconsistent with the assumptions of Ein-Dor *et al*. To see the practical contribution of these results observe that as mentioned by Ein-Dor *et al*, the performance of their methodology depends on the existence of their preliminary assumptions. Finally, with regard to the sensitivity of this methodology to the model assumptions, the issue of testing these assumptions by empirical data is revisited by conduction of simulation analysis.

1 Introduction

In clinical research, the need for sensitive and reliable predictors of outcome is most acute for early discovery of metastases. In the recent decades,

*Statistics Department, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
†Comments may be sent to *royi.jacobovic@mail.huji.ac.il*.

gene-expression data is available and can be used for this purpose. From a statistical point of view, this kind of data is hard to analyze because the number of genes is up to tens of thousands while the measurements of the gene-expressions are associated with nonnegligible observational noise. In particular, it may be hard to pinpoint the most predictive genes. Motivated by this issue, [9, 31] suggested a Bayesian modeling of the observational noise and then, with regard to this modelling, they argued that thousands of samples are needed to generate a robust gene-list for predicting outcome. Notice that they defined robustness as having 50% overlap in the list of the top-k with k of the order of few dozens.

The current work reveals that the stochastic framework which was suggested in [9, 31] is inconsistent with certain kinds of popular assumptions such as sparsity (e.g. [3, 20]) and Gaussianity (e.g. [15, 29]) that are made over the joint distribution of the data. Notice that these assumptions are commonly made by applied researchers and [9, 31] alerted that violation of their original assumptions may lead to inaccurate results. Finally, another topic to be discussed is the empirical Bayes (EB) approach for testing the model assumptions as described by [9, 31]. In this context, it is shown that EB approach may not detect severe violation of these assumptions and hence to lead to biased estimation of the needed sample size.

The rest of this part is organized as follows: Section 2 presents detailed description of the statistical model which was used in [9, 31]. Sections 3 and 4 include rigorous statements and proofs of the circumstances under which inconsistencies with the assumptions of [9, 31] take place. In particular, section 3 is focused on the inconsistencies that can be created due to sparsity assumption. Section 4 makes sufficient and necessary conditions for asymptotic independence of the sample correlations under the Bayesian modeling of [9, 31]. In particular, it is shown that Gaussianity assumption over the joint distribution of the data causes a violation of the preliminary assumptions of [9, 31]. Section 5 shows an example that exemplifies how the empirical Bayes approach of [9, 31] for testing the model assumptions may not detect severe violations of the model assumptions and consequently too pessimistic results with regard to the needed sample-size are obtained. Finally, section 6 is devoted to a brief summary about the contributions of this work and directions for further research.

2 Statistical Model

Let $(X_{1j}, \ldots, X_{kj}, Y_j) \overset{iid}{\sim} (X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y), j = 1, \ldots, n$, be an i.i.d sample of n observations from some $(k+1)$-dimensional parametric multivariate distribution $F(\cdot; \theta); \theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^l$, whose parameters are drawn from a prior distribution, $G(\cdot)$. Adapting the statistical terminology that $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ are features and Y is the target variable, a situation where the number of observations is less than the number of features may lead the statistician to confront with the curses and blessings of dimensionality [8].[1] The general approach to handle such circumstances is to choose the best features to explain Y, i.e. to perform feature selection. One class of procedures to pinpoint the best features is based on the following Pearson coefficients of correlation

$$\rho_i := \rho(X_i, Y) = \frac{C(X_i, Y)}{\sqrt{V(X_i)V(Y)}} \quad , \quad i = 1, \ldots, k$$

where $C(\cdot)$ and $V(\cdot)$ are the covariance and variance operators, respectively.[2] Considering the fact that the statistician has no direct access to the true correlations, [9, 31] suggested a method to evaluate the number of required observations in order to obtain a reliable list of features that are highly correlated with Y when $k \to \infty$. Denote the sample analogues of $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_k$ by $r_n^1, \ldots, r_n^k$ and recall that the Fisher's transformation [11, 12], $\phi : (-1, 1) \to \mathbb{R}$, is defined by

$$\phi(h) := \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{1+h}{1-h}$$

, [9, 31] made the following statistical assumptions:

1. **Prior Distribution.** $G(\cdot)$ is such that $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_q^2)$, where $\sigma_q^2 > 0$.[3]

[1] Notice that in the context of statistical analysis of gene-expression microarray datasets, the features are the genes and the target variable is the survival status. In particular, observe that in the datasets which were used by [9, 31], the survival status is a binary variable.

[2] For more information about this class of procedures see [18, 13, 30].

[3] [9] assumes that the distribution of the Fisher tranformations of the true correlations can be 'approximated' by centered Gaussian distribution with variance $\sigma_q^2 > 0$. Since the notion of approximation is not mentioned in [9], the abovementioned assumption 1 is taken from [31]. Notice that [31] considers a more general settings by letting $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} q(\cdot)$ where $q(\cdot)$ is a general density.

2. **Asymptotic Independence.** Given θ, $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$ are asymptotically independent random-variables.[4]

3. **Asymptotic Normality.** Given θ, $\sqrt{n-3}\Big(\phi(r_n^i) - \phi(\rho_i)\Big) \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} N(0,1), \quad i = 1, \ldots, k$.[5]

3 Sparsity Assumption

To make the statement of this section, denote the correlation between X_i and X_j $(i, j = 1, \ldots, k)$ by $\rho_{x_i x_j}$. With respect to this notation, it is proved that if assumption 1 is satisfied then the correlation matrix of $(X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y)$ is continuously distributed. In particular, it is shown that this result implies that sparse models, i.e. models that with positive probability let at least one pair of genes to be uncorrelated, are inconsistent with assumption 1 (Prior Distribution).

Theorem 1 *Let $G(\cdot)$ to be a prior distribution which satisfies assumption 1. If so, for any fixed value $c \in (-1, 1)$ and $F(\cdot; \theta)$ which is almost surely associated with finite first two moments with respect to the measure of $G(\cdot)$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\rho_{x_i x_j} = c) = 0 \quad , \quad \forall 1 \leq i < j \leq k$$

where the probability is calculated with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure.

Remark 3.1 Observe that if $c \in \{-1, 1\}$ then there is no loss of information by discarding either gene i or gene j from the dataset. Therefore, with regard to this understanding, Theorem 1 makes no reference to this case.

Remark 3.2 Notice that the fact that assumption 1 implies a continuous distribution over the correlation matrix of $(X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y)$ is a straightforward corollary from Theorem 1.

Proof: Assume by contradiction and w.l.o.g. that there exists $c \in (-1, 1)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{x_1 x_2} = c) > 0$ where the probability is calculated with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure. Since $G(\cdot)$ is a probability distribution over Θ and it is

[4] This assumption is a relaxed version of the independence assumption in [9, 31].

[5] The notation $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}$ refers to convergence in law of a sequence of random variables. Exact definition is provided in [10].

given that almost surely $F(\cdot;\theta)$ is associated with finite first two moments, then the probability (with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure) that the correlation matrix of (X_1, X_2, Y) is positive semidefinite equals to one. However, since $\mathbb{P}(\rho_{x_1x_2} = c) > 0$, with positive probability the characteristic polynomial of the correlation matrix of (X_1, X_2, Y) is given by

$$P(\lambda) = \det \begin{pmatrix} 1-\lambda & c & \rho_1 \\ c & 1-\lambda & \rho_2 \\ \rho_1 & \rho_2 & 1-\lambda \end{pmatrix} =$$

$$= (1-\lambda)^3 - (1-\lambda)(\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2 + c^2) + 2c\rho_1\rho_2$$

At this stage, there are two optional cases: $c = 0$ and $c \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$. For each case it is shown that the correlation matrix of (X_1, X_2, Y) has negative eigenvalue with positive probability and hence a contradiction is obtained.

Case 1:
Assume that $c = 0$. If so, with positive probability the eigenvalues of Γ are defined as the solutions of the following equation:

$$P(\lambda) = (1-\lambda)^3 - (1-\lambda)(\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2) = 0$$

Observe that one possible solution is given by $\lambda^0 = 1 - \sqrt{\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2}$. Clearly, since $\phi(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing and $\phi(\rho_1), \phi(\rho_2) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_q^2)$, then $\rho_1^2 + \rho_2^2$ is continuously distributed over $[0, 2]$. Therefore, the event of having $\lambda^0 < 0$ occurs with positive probability with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure.

Case 2:
Assume that $c \in (-1, 1) \setminus \{0\}$. If so, set $\rho_1 = 0$ and obtain the following equation:

$$P(\lambda) = (1-\lambda)^3 - (1-\lambda)(c^2 + \rho_2^2) = 0$$

Clearly, if $\rho_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2-c^2}{2}} \in (-1, 1)$, then one root of $P(\lambda)$ is given by $\lambda^0 = 1 - \sqrt{1 + \frac{c^2}{2}} < 0$, i.e. there is a negative solution to the equation $P\left(\lambda; \rho_1 = 0, \rho_2 = \sqrt{\frac{2-c^2}{2}}\right) = 0$. Since Cardano formula [7] implies that the solutions of the equation $P(\lambda; \rho_1, \rho_2) = 0$ are continuous in (ρ_1, ρ_2) at the point $(0, \sqrt{\frac{2-c^2}{2}})$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in$

$B_\delta\Big(0, \sqrt{\frac{2-c^2}{2}}\Big) \subset (-1,1)^2$, the polynomial $P(\lambda;\rho_1,\rho_2)$ is associated with negative root. Since $\phi(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing and $\phi(\rho_1), \phi(\rho_2) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0,\sigma_q^2)$, then (ρ_1,ρ_2) are continuously distributed over $(-1,1)^2$. Therefore, the event of having $(\rho_1,\rho_2) \in B_\delta\Big(0, \sqrt{\frac{2-c^2}{2}}\Big)$ occurs with positive probability and hence, with positive probability with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure, $P(\lambda)$ is associated with negative root.

■

Corollary 1 *Let $G(\cdot)$ to be a prior distribution which satisfies assumption 1. If so, for any fixed value $c \in (-1,1)$ and $F(\cdot;\theta)$ which is almost surely associated with finite first two moments with respect to the measure of $G(\cdot)$*

$$\mathbb{P}(\exists 1 \leq i < j \leq k \quad s.t. \quad \rho_{x_i x_j} = c) = 0$$

where the probability is taken with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure.

Proof: To make this proof, fix $c \in (-1,1)$ and use Theorem 1 to obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \leq \mathbb{P}(\exists 1 \leq i < j \leq k \quad s.t. \quad \rho_{x_i x_j} = c) = \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\cup_{1\leq i<j\leq k}\{\rho_{x_i x_j} = c\}) \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq k} \mathbb{P}(\rho_{x_i x_j} = c) = \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq k} 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

■

Remark 3.3 Observe that the proofs of Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 would remain valid if assumption 1 were phrased as follows: $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} q(\cdot)$ such that $q(\cdot)$ is a continuous distribution over $\mathbb{R}$.

Remark 3.4 Notice that when $c = 0$, as a private case of Corollary 1, any sparse model, i.e. a model under which the probability of having at least one pair of genes that are uncorrelated is positive, is inconsistent with assumption 1 (Prior Distribution).

4 Asymptotic Independence

Considering the Bayesian framework of [9, 31], this section provides necessary and sufficient conditions over the moments of $F(\cdot;\theta)$ for satisfying assumption 2 (Asymptotic independence). While this result is summarized by Theorem 2, Theorem 3 is an example of how Theorem 2 can be used to show that certain model is inconsistent with the original assumptions of [9, 31]. More precisely, Theorem 3 states that the Gaussian model $(X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y|\Sigma) \sim N_{k+1}(0, \Sigma)$ is inconsistent with the assumptions of [9, 31].

Theorem 2 *If $\theta \sim G(\cdot)$ such that assumption 1 is satisfied and $(X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y|\theta) \sim F(\cdot;\theta)$ such that $F(\cdot;\theta)$ is associated with finite first four moments almost surely, then assumption 2 holds iff for any $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, the following equation holds with probability one with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure:*

$$-\frac{\rho_j}{2\sigma_{x_j}^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_{x_i}^2}C(X_i^2, X_j^2) - \frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, X_j^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_i}\sigma_y}C(X_iY, X_j^2)\Big] -$$

$$-\frac{\rho_j}{2\sigma_y^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_{x_i}^2}C(X_i^2, Y^2) - \frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, Y^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_i}\sigma_y}C(X_iY, Y^2)\Big] +$$

$$+\frac{1}{\sigma_{x_j}\sigma_y}\Big[-\frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_{x_i}^2}C(X_i^2, X_jY) - \frac{\rho_i}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, X_jY) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_i}\sigma_y}C(X_iY, X_jY)\Big] = 0$$

Theorem 3 *Let $\Sigma \sim G(\cdot)$ and $(X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y|\Sigma) \sim N_{k+1}(0, \Sigma)$. If $G(\cdot)$ satisfies assumption 1, then*

1. *$G(\cdot)$ is a continuous distribution over the set of symmetric positive semidefinite matrices*
2. *Assumption 2 is violated with positive probability with respect to the measure of $G(\cdot)$.*

4.1 Proofs

The proof of Theorem 2 is heavily based on the delta method technique [4]. Formally it is given by the following lemma. For more information one can read chapter 7 of [10].

Lemma 1 ***(Delta Method)*** *If Σ is a positive definite covariance matrix and $\hat{\beta}_n$ is a consistent estimator of a parameter $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^l$ which is calculated by n samples such that*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, \Sigma)$$

, then for any differentiable function $f(\cdot) : \mathbb{R}^l \to \mathbb{R}^d$, the following convergence holds:

$$\sqrt{n}\Big(f(\hat{\beta}_n) - f(\beta)\Big) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N\Big(0, [\nabla f(\beta)]^T \Sigma \nabla f(\beta)\Big)$$

where $\nabla f(\tilde{\beta})$ is the partial derivative matrix of $f(\cdot)$ at the point $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^l$.

Proof: (Theorem 2) To start with, make the following notations:

$$m_{x_i} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} \quad , \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$m_{x_i^2} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij}^2 \quad , \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$m_{x_i y} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} X_{ij} Y_j \quad , \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$m_y := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_j$$

$$m_{y^2} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_j^2$$

$$s_{x_i}^2 := m_{x_i^2} - m_{x_i}^2 \quad , \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$s_{x_i y} := m_{x_i y} - m_{x_i} m_y \quad , \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$s_y^2 := m_{y^2} - m_y^2$$

Using these notations, the sample correlations can be written as:

$$r_i := r_n^i = \frac{s_{x_i y}}{s_{x_i} s_y} \quad , i = 1, \ldots, k$$

It is given that $F(\cdot; \theta)$ is associated with finite first four moments and hence by multivariate CLT

$$\sqrt{n}\left[\begin{pmatrix} m_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k} \\ m_y \\ m_{x_1^2} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k^2} \\ m_{y^2} \\ m_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma_{x_1}^2 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k}^2 \\ \sigma_y^2 \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} N_{3k+2}(0, \Sigma^1)$$

where the covariance matrix Σ^1 is given by $\Sigma^1_{ij} = C(Z_i, Z_j), 1 \leq i, j \leq 3k+2$ and Z is as follows:

$$Z = (X_1, \ldots, X_k, Y, X_1^2, \ldots, X_k^2, Y^2, X_1 Y, \ldots, X_k Y) \quad .$$

Define a function $\eta : \mathbb{R}^{3k+2} \to \mathbb{R}^{2k+1}$ as follows

$$\eta(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z_{k+1+1} - z_1^2 \\ \vdots \\ z_{k+1+k+1} - z_{k+1}^2 \\ z_{2k+2+1} - z_{k+1} z_1 \\ \vdots \\ z_{2k+2+k} - z_{k+1} z_k \end{pmatrix}$$

and notice that it satisfies

1.

$$\eta\left[\begin{pmatrix} m_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k} \\ m_y \\ m_{x_1^2} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k^2} \\ m_{y^2} \\ m_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ m_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}\right] = \begin{pmatrix} s^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k} \\ s^2_y \\ s_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}$$

2.

$$\nabla\eta(z) = \begin{pmatrix} -2diag(z_1, \ldots, z_{k+1}) & B \\ I_{k+1\times k+1} & 0_{k+1\times k} \\ 0_{k\times k+1} & I_{k\times k} \end{pmatrix}$$

where the matrix B is given by

$$B := \begin{pmatrix} -z_{k+1} I_{k\times k} \\ -z_1, \ldots, -z_k \end{pmatrix}$$

Apply the multivariate delta method in order to obtain the limit

$$\sqrt{n}\left[\begin{pmatrix} s^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k} \\ s^2_y \\ s_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k} \\ \sigma^2_y \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} N_{2k+1}(0, \Sigma^2)$$

where Σ^2 is given by

$$\Sigma^2 = \nabla\eta^T \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k} \\ \sigma^2_y \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix} \right] \Sigma^1 \nabla\eta \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \sigma^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k} \\ \sigma^2_y \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix} \right]$$

Notice that for the vector of inputs written above $\nabla\eta$ is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} O_{k+1\times k+1} & O_{k+1\times k} \\ I_{k+1\times k+1} & O_{k+1\times k} \\ O_{k\times k+1} & I_{k\times k} \end{pmatrix}$$

which implies that Σ^2 equals to the down-right $2k+1 \times 2k+1$ block of Σ^1. Considering this result, define another function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}^{2k+1} \to \mathbb{R}^k$ as follows

$$\gamma(v) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{v_{k+1+1}}{\sqrt{v_{k+1} v_1}} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{v_{k+1+k}}{\sqrt{v_{k+1} v_k}} \end{pmatrix}$$

and observe that

1.
$$\gamma \left[\begin{pmatrix} s^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k} \\ s^2_y \\ s_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ s^2_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix} \right] = \begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ \vdots \\ r_k \end{pmatrix}$$

2.

$$\nabla\gamma^T(v) = \Big[A_1|A_2|A_3\Big]$$

where the matrices A_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are given by

$$A_1 := -diag\Big(\frac{v_{k+1+1}}{2\sqrt{v_1^3 v_{k+1}}}, \ldots, \frac{v_{k+1+k}}{2\sqrt{v_k^3 v_{k+1}}}\Big)$$

$$A_2 := -\Big(\frac{v_{k+1+1}}{2\sqrt{v_1 v_{k+1}^3}}, \ldots, \frac{v_{k+1+k}}{2\sqrt{v_k v_{k+1}^3}}\Big)^T$$

$$A_3 := diag\Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{v_1 v_{k+1}}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{v_k v_{k+1}}}\Big)$$

Therefore, by using the multivariate delta method once again, obtain the limit

$$\sqrt{n}\left[\begin{pmatrix} r_1 \\ \vdots \\ r_k \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 \\ \vdots \\ \rho_k \end{pmatrix}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} N_k[0, \Sigma^3]$$

where Σ^3 is given by

$$\Sigma^3 = \nabla\gamma^T \left[\begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k} \\ \sigma^2_y \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}\right] \Sigma^2 \nabla\gamma \left[\begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2_{x_1} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma^2_{x_k} \\ \sigma^2_y \\ \sigma_{x_1 y} \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_{x_k y} \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

Define $\phi^* : (-1, 1)^k \to \mathbb{R}^k$ as follows

$$\phi^*(w) := \big(\phi(w_1), \ldots, \phi(w_k)\big)^T$$

and notice that $\phi(\cdot)$ is differentiable in its domain and hence its derivative matrix is given by

$$\nabla\phi^*(w) = diag[\phi'(w_1), \ldots, \phi'(w_k)]$$

If so, an additional execution of the multivariate delta method implies that

$$\sqrt{n}\left[\begin{pmatrix}\phi(r_1)\\ \vdots \\ \phi(r_k)\end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix}\phi(\rho_1)\\ \vdots \\ \phi(\rho_k)\end{pmatrix}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\mathcal{L}} N_K[0,\Sigma^4]$$

where Σ^4 is given by

$$[\Sigma^4]_{ij} = \phi'(\rho_i)\phi'(\rho_j)[\Sigma^3]_{ij} \quad , \quad 1 \le i,j \le k$$

Observe that $\phi'(\cdot)$ is positive for any possible input and recalling that non-correlation is equivalent to independence under Gaussian law, then for any $i \neq j$ asymptotic independence of $\phi(r_i)$ and $\phi(r_j)$ is equivalent to $[\Sigma^3]_{ij} = 0$. For simplicity and w.l.o.g it is enough to prove the claim for the specific case where $i = 1$ and $j = 2$. In this case $\phi(r_1)$ and $\phi(r_2)$ are asymptotically independent iff the following equation holds

$$0 = \Sigma^3_{12} = \begin{pmatrix}-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_{x_1}}\\ 0\\ \vdots\\ 0\\ -\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_y}\\ \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_2}\sigma_y}\\ 0\\ \vdots\\ 0\end{pmatrix}^T \Sigma^2 \begin{pmatrix}0\\ -\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma^2_{x_2}}\\ \vdots\\ 0\\ -\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma^2_y}\\ 0\\ \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_2}\sigma_y}\\ \vdots\\ 0\end{pmatrix} = \tag{1}$$

$$= -\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma^2_{x_2}}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_{x_1}}C(X_1^2,X_2^2) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_y}C(Y^2,X_2^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y,X_2^2)\Big] -$$

$$-\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma^2_y}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_{x_1}}C(X_1^2,Y^2) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_y}C(Y^2,Y^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y,Y^2)\Big] +$$

$$+\frac{1}{\sigma_{x_2}\sigma_y}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_{x_1}}C(X_1^2,X_2Y) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma^2_y}C(Y^2,X_2Y) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y,X_2Y)\Big]$$

which is exactly the needed result.

■

Proof: (Theorem 3) Observe that the first insight immediately stems from Remark 3.2. To make the second statement, for simplicity, observe that it is enough to prove that with positive probability with respect to the measure

of $G(\cdot)$, r_n^1 and r_n^2 are not asymptotically independent. Since (X_1, X_2, Y) is multivariate Gaussian, by Isserlis theorem [19], each of the covariances appearing in equation (1) can be expressed in terms of $\sigma_{x_1}^2 := V(X_1)$, $\sigma_{x_2}^2 := V(X_2)$, $\sigma_{x_1x_2} := C(X_1, X_2)$, $\sigma_{x_1y} := C(X_1, Y)$ and $\sigma_{x_2y} := C(X_2, Y)$:

$$C(X_1^2, X_2^2) = \mathbb{E}(X_1^2X_2^2) - \mathbb{E}(X_1^2)\mathbb{E}(X_2^2) = \sigma_{x_1}^2\sigma_{x_2}^2 + 2\sigma_{x_1x_2}^2 - \sigma_{x_1}^2\sigma_{x_2}^2 = 2\sigma_{x_1x_2}^2$$

$$C(Y^2, X_2^2) = \cdots = 2\sigma_{x_2y}^2$$

$$C(X_1Y, X_2^2) = \mathbb{E}(X_1YX_2^2) - \mathbb{E}(X_1Y)\mathbb{E}(X_2^2) = \sigma_{x_2}^2\sigma_{x_1y} + 2\sigma_{x_1x_2}\sigma_{x_2y} - \sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_{x_2}^2 = 2\sigma_{x_1x_2}\sigma_{x_2y}$$

$$C(X_1^2, Y^2) = \cdots = 2\sigma_{x_1y}^2$$

$$C(Y^2, Y^2) = \mathbb{E}(Y^4) - \mathbb{E}(Y^2)\mathbb{E}(Y^2) = 3\sigma_y^4 - \sigma_y^2\sigma_y^2 = 2\sigma_y^4$$

$$C(X_1Y, Y^2) - \mathbb{E}(X_1Y) - \mathbb{E}(X_1Y)\mathbb{E}(Y^2) = 3\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1y} - \sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_y^2 = 2\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1y}$$

$$C(X_1^2, X_2Y) = \cdots = 2\sigma_{x_1x_2}\sigma_{x_1y}$$

$$C(Y, X_2Y) = \cdots = 2\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_2y}$$

$$C(X_1Y, X_2Y) = \mathbb{E}(X_1X_2Y^2) - \mathbb{E}(X_1Y)\mathbb{E}(X_2Y) = \sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1x_2} + 2\sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_{x_2y} - \sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_{x_2y} =$$

$$= \sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1x_2} + \sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_{x_2y}$$

By insertion of these expressions into (1), a sufficient and necessary condition for asymptotic independence of $\phi(r_1)$ and $\phi(r_2)$ is given by:

$$[\Sigma^3]_{12} = -\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma_{x_2}^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}C(X_1^2, X_2^2) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, X_2^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y, X_2^2)\Big] -$$

$$-\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma_y^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}C(X_1^2, Y^2) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, Y^2) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y, Y^2)\Big] +$$

$$+\frac{1}{\sigma_{x_2}\sigma_y}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}C(X_1^2, X_2Y) - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}C(Y^2, X_2Y) + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}C(X_1Y, X_2Y)\Big] =$$

$$= -\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma_{x_2}^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}2\sigma_{x_1x_2}^2 - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}2\sigma_{x_2y}^2 + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}2\sigma_{x_1x_2}\sigma_{x_2y}\Big] -$$

$$-\frac{\rho_2}{2\sigma_y^2}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}2\sigma_{x_1y}^2 - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}2\sigma_y^4 + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}2\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1y}\Big] +$$

$$+\frac{1}{\sigma_{x_2}\sigma_y}\Big[-\frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_{x_1}^2}2\sigma_{x_1x_2}\sigma_{x_1y} - \frac{\rho_1}{2\sigma_y^2}2\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_2y} + \frac{1}{\sigma_{x_1}\sigma_y}(\sigma_y^2\sigma_{x_1x_2} + \sigma_{x_1y}\sigma_{x_2y})\Big] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{2}\rho_1\rho_2\rho_{x_1x_2}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho_1\rho_2^3 - \rho_2^2\rho_{x_1x_2} +$$
$$+\frac{1}{2}\rho_1^3\rho_2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho_1\rho_2 - \rho_1\rho_2 -$$
$$-\rho_1^2\rho_{x_1x_2} - \rho_1\rho_2 + \rho_{x_1x_2} + \rho_1\rho_2 =$$
$$= \rho_{x_1x_2}^2\frac{1}{2}\rho_1\rho_2 + \rho_{x_1x_2}(1-\rho_1^2-\rho_2^2) + \frac{1}{2}[\rho_1\rho_2^3 + \rho_1^3\rho_2 - \rho_1\rho_2] = 0 \quad (2)$$

where $\rho_{x_1x_2} := \sigma_{x_1x_2}/\sqrt{\sigma_{x_1}^2\sigma_{x_2}^2}$. Observe that assumption 2 is satisfied only if $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in [-1,1]^2$ satisfies equation (2). The next step is to show that with positive probability this is not the case. To see this, notice that statement 1 implies that $\rho_i \neq 0, i = 1,2$ almost surely. Therefore, equation (2) is almost surely a quadratic equation in $\rho_{x_1x_2}$ that, depending on the values of ρ_1 and ρ_2, might not have a solution. Indeed, if $(\rho_1, \rho_2) = (0.5, 0.9) \in (-1,1)^2$, then the discriminant of the quadratic equation equals to -0.0085.

Now, the fact that the discriminant of the quadratic equation is continuous in ρ_1 and ρ_2 at the point (0.5,0.9) implies that there exists some $\delta > 0$ such that the discriminant is negative for any $(\rho_1, \rho_2) \in B_\delta(0.5, 0.9) \subset (-1,1)^2$. If so, because there is a configuration of Σ which is positive definite which satisfies $(\rho_1, \rho_2) = (0.5, 0.9)$, then the openness of the set of positive definite matrices and the fact that $G(\cdot)$ is a continuous prior distribution over this set of matrices implies existence of $0 < \delta' < \delta$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\Big(\{\rho_1, \rho_2\} \subset B_{\delta'}(0.5, 0.9)\Big) > 0$$

, i.e. there is no solution for (2) with positive probability with respect to $G(\cdot)$'s measure.

■

Remark 4.1 Observe that the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 would remain valid if assumption 1 were phrased as follows: $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} q(\cdot)$ such that $q(\cdot)$ is a continuous distribution over $\mathbb{R}$.

5 Testing Assumptions

The findings of sections 3 and 4 show that popular assumptions such as sparsity and normality may lead to inconsistency with the original assumptions of [9, 31]. Since [9] mentioned that violation of these assumptions may influence the performance of their methodology, it suggested an empirical Bayes

approach to test whether assumptions 1-3 hold. The testing methodology which is described in the supplementary materials of [9] and implemented in [9, 31] is essentially based on checking whether the empirical distribution of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$ is Gaussian. With regard to this approach, this section presents an example for a model which strongly violates the assumptions 1-3 but generates Fisher-transformed sample correlations whose empirical distribution seems to be Gaussian. Then, it is shown that for this case, application of the methodology of [9, 31] in order to assess the required sample-size returns too pessimistic evaluation.

5.1 Model Description

In general, the next example captures the following typicalities of gene-expression datasets:

1. There are many genes, i.e. $k >> 1$ (20000 in humans).
2. Only a small fraction of the genes are correlated with the target variable.
3. Those genes that are correlated with the target variable are associated with low correlation.

In details, the model assumes that there are $k = 20000$ genes. Now, let $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_k)$ be a vector which is distributed uniformly over the set of k dimensional vectors that include $0 < u << k$ ones and $k - u$ zeros (u is known). Then, let $X = (X_1, \ldots, X_k|\beta) \sim N_k(0, I)$ and set $Y|(\beta, X) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i X_i$.

Now, it is easy to see that this model strongly violates assumption 1 since the distribution of $\big(\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k)\big)$ is not continuous. However, as it seems from Figures 1 and 2, $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$ are distributed with respect to some centered Gaussian law. Hence, [9, 31] says that assumptions 1-3 may be carried out and provide good approximation for the needed sample-size.

5.2 Direct Approach

Given a dataset, i.e. a set of n i.i.d realizations from the Bayesian model of subsection 5.1, a direct approach to pinpoint the u genes which are correlated with the target variable was suggested by [9, 31]. This approach tells the user to compute the absolute values of the sample-correlations of all genes with the target variable and pick the u genes whose absolute sample correlations are the highest.

Algorithm 1 Computation of Figures 1 and 2

Input: $n = 59$, $k = 20000$, $u = 200$ (Figure 1) and $u = 100$ (Figure 2).
Output: Histogram and normal QQ-plot of a random realization of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$.
for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ **do**
    `// Draw` $(X_{1j}, \ldots, X_{kj}) \sim N_k(0, I)$.
    `// Set` $Y_j = \sum_{i=1}^{u} X_{ij}$.
end for
for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ **do**
    `// Compute the empirical correlation between the vectors` $(X_{i1}, \ldots, X_{in})$ `and` $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ `and denote it by` r_n^i.
end for
return Histogram and normal QQ-plot of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$.



Figure 1: This figure presents the histogram and normal QQ-plot of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^{20000})$ which were calculated by a sample of 59 i.i.d observations from the Bayesian model which was described in subsection 5.1 where $u = 200$. Notice that due to symmetry considerations, the parametrization of β which was drawn at the first stage of the simulation has no effect on any of these diagrams. With respect to this understanding, to save running time, the simulation considered β such that $\beta_j = 1, j = 1, \ldots, 200$ and $\beta_j = 0, j > 200$.



Figure 2: This figure presents the histogram and normal QQ-plot of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^{20000})$ which were calculated by a sample of 59 i.i.d observations from the Bayesian model which was described in subsection 5.1 where $u = 100$. Notice that due to symmetry considerations, the parametrization of β which was drawn at the first stage of the simulation has no effect on any of these diagrams. With respect to this understanding, to save running time, the simulation considered β such that $\beta_j = 1, j = 1, \ldots, 100$ and $\beta_j = 0, j > 100$.

Remark 5.1 Notice that due to the same symmetry considerations that are done in the algorithm used to create Figure 1, w.l.o.g. the algorithm of the direct approach considers only $\beta_j = 1, j = 1, \ldots, u$ and $\beta_j = 0$, $j > u$.

5.3 Approximation Approach

Since Figure 1 shows that that the empirical distribution of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$ looks like a Gaussian, [9, 31] claimed that assumptions 1-3 might be done and provide approximated results in low computational effort. In practice, this approach tells the user to draw $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_q^2)$. Then, the empirical values are created by adding Gaussian noise $\phi(r_i) = \phi(\rho_i) + z_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$ such that $z_1, \ldots, z_k \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \frac{1}{n-3})$. Finally, one should pick the u features which are associated with the highest absolute empirical values. Notice that in order to examine the approximation approach numerically by Monte-Carlo simulation, the value of σ_q^2 must be specified. Practically, as suggested by [9, 31], σ_q is estimated by $\hat{\sigma}_q = \sqrt{W - \frac{1}{n-3}}$ where W is the empirical variance of $\phi(r_n^1), \ldots, \phi(r_n^k)$.

Algorithm 2 Direct Approach vs. Approximation Approach Simulation.

Input: n, k, u, B.
Output: Estimates of the expectation and standard deviation of the proportion of genes that are selected correctly by the direct and approximation approaches.
for $t = 1, \ldots, B$ **do**
    for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ **do**
        // Draw $(X_{1j}, \ldots, X_{kj}) \sim N_k(0, I)$.
        // Set $Y_j = \sum_{i=1}^{u} X_{ij}$.
    end for
    for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ **do**
        // Compute the empirical correlation between the vectors $(X_{i1}, \ldots, X_{in})$ and $(Y_1, \ldots, Y_n)$ and note it by r_n^i.
        // Compute $d_t = \frac{1}{u} \sum_{i=1}^{u} I_i$ where I_i indicates whether $|r_n^i(t)|$ is one of the u highest values of the vector $(|r_n^1(t)|, \ldots, |r_n^1(t)|)$.
    end for
    // Compute the empirical variance of $r_n^1, \ldots, r_n^k$ and denote it by W.
    // Set $\hat{\sigma}_q = \sqrt{W - \frac{1}{n-3}}$
    // Draw $\phi(\rho_1), \ldots, \phi(\rho_k) \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_q^2)$.
    // Compute the set of indices which are associated with the u highest values of the vector $(|\phi(\rho_1)|, \ldots, |\phi(\rho_k)|)$ and denote it by S_1.
    // Draw $z_1, \ldots, z_k \overset{iid}{\sim} N(0, \frac{1}{n-3})$.
    for $i = 1, \ldots, k$ **do**
        // Compute $v_i = |r_i + z_i|$.
    end for
    // Compute the set of indices which are associated with the u highest values of the vector $(v_1, \ldots, v_k)$ and denote it by S_2.
    // Compute $c_t = \frac{|S_1 \cap S_2|}{u}$
end for
$\bar{d} =: \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{B} d_t, \bar{c} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{B} c_t$
return $\bar{d}$, $\bar{c}$, $\sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{B} (\bar{d} - d_t)^2}$, $\sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{t=1}^{B} (\bar{c} - c_t)^2}$

Remark 5.2 Notice that [9] proposed an additional ad-hoc methodology

to estimate σ_q in circumstances under which assumption 2 (Asymptotic Independence) doesn't hold.

5.4 Simulation Results

With regard to these procedures, the goal is to estimate the expected proportion of correlated genes that are chosen by each of these procedures as a function of the sample-size, n. Motivated by this issue, Figures 2 and 3 present the results of Monte-Carlo simulations. These figures consider $u = 200, 100$ respectively and indicate that the direct approach is much more positively affected from the growth in the value of n compared to the approximation one. Notice that this leads to the conclusion that the approach of [9, 31] may provide too pessimistic when it is performed over data generating process which doesn't satisfy its preliminary assumptions.



Figure 3: This figure presents the estimated relations between the sample-size (horizontal axis) and the proportion of correct selections (vertical axis) as done by the direct (continuous blue line) and approximated (red dotted line) approaches. The parameters in this sketch are $B = 10$, $k = 20000$, $u = 200$ and the sample sizes are $n = 300, 400, 500 \ldots, 1000$. Notice that all of the standard deviations returned by this simulation are smaller than 0.025.



Figure 4: This figure presents the estimated relations between the sample-size (horizontal axis) and the proportion of correct selections (vertical axis) as done by the direct (continuous blue line) and approximated (red dotted line) approaches. The parameters in this sketch are $B = 10$, $k = 20000$, $u = 100$ and the sample sizes are $n = 300, 400, 500 \ldots, 1000$. Notice that all of the standard deviations returned by this simulation are smaller than 0.045.

6 Summary and Concluding Remarks

This work shows that popular assumptions such as sparsity and Gaussianity are not consistent with the assumptions of [9, 31]. Moreover it has been demonstrated that:

1. The methodology of [9, 31] to test the model assumptions may not detect severe violations.

2. The evaluations of [9, 31] to the needed sample size may be extremely biased if the assumptions 1-3 are not satisfied by the data generating process.

These findings lead to the following directions for further research:

1. Development of Bayesian models that satisfy assumptions 1-3 and are not too complex from a statistical point of view. Especially, besides the mathematical requirements that they must satisfy, they should also be flexible in the sense that they capture the informative richness of gene-expression microarray datasets.

2. Development of better methodologies for testing the statistical assumptions made over the data. With respect to this point, notice

that such development should be done in the framework of the empirical Bayes literature. Otherwise, in the classical Bayesian context the prior distribution is a belief that can't be checked.

3. Comparative research between the methodology of [9, 31] and the techniques from the literature of ranking and selection (R&S) procedures. Generally speaking, this literature investigates procedures for ranking and selection from stochastic populations by their statistical properties such as mean, variance, R-squared with a target variable, etc. To see the relevancy of this literature, observe that the question of ranking and selection of features by their correlations with some target variable was investigated by [1, 2, 21, 22, 25, 26, 28] in the context of this literature. In-addition, it worths mentioning that there exists a modern research that investigates how to apply this theory to gene-expression microarray data (e.g [5, 6]).

Finally, all the simulation results that were discussed had been output of standard R program. The code is available in the following appendix.

Acknowledgment: I'd like to thank Or Zuk and Eytan Domany for their important comments.

References

[1] Alam, K. (1979). *Distribution of sample correlation coefficients. Naval Research Logistics (NRL), Vol 26, Issue 2,p. 327-330.*

[2] Alam, K., Rizvi, M. H. and Solomon, H. (1976). *Selection of largest multiple correlation coefficients : exact sample size case. Ann. Statist. (4) 614-620.*

[3] Caravlho, C., Chang, J., Lucas, J., Nevins, J., Wang, Q. and West, M. (2008). *High-dimensional sparse factor modeling: applications in gene expression genomics. J. Am. Statist. Assoc. 103, 1438-56.*

[4] Cramér, H. (1946). *Mathematical Methods of Statistics, p. 353.*

[5] Cui X. and Wilson J. (2008). *On the probability of correct selection for large k populations with application to microarray data. Biometrical Journal 2008a;50(5):833-870. [PubMed: 18932145]*

[6] Cui, X., Zhao, H. and Wilson, J. (2010). *Optimized ranking and selection methods for feature selection with application in microarray experiments, Journal of Biopharmaceutical statistics, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 223-239.*

[7] Dickson, L. E. (1914). *Elementary Theory of Equations. New York: Wiley, pp. 36-37.*

[8] Donoho, D. (2000). *High-dimensional data analysis: The curses and blessings of dimensionality. Aide-Memoire*

[9] Ein-Dor, L., Zuk, O. and Domany, E. (2006). *Thousands of samples are needed to generate a robust gene list for predicting outcome in cancer. Proc. Nat. Ac. Sci. 103:5923-5928.*

[10] Ferguson, T. S. (1996). *A course in large sample theory. London: Chapman and Hall.*

[11] Fisher, R.A. (1915). *Frequency distribution of the values of the correlation coefficient in samples from an indefinitely large population. Biometrika 10 (4): 507-521.*

[12] R.A. Fisher. (1921). *On the probable error of a coefficient of correlation deduced from a small sample. Metron 1:3-32, 1921.*

[13] Guyon, I. and Elisseeff, A. (2003). *An introduction to variable and feature selection, The Journal of Machine Learning Research, 3.*

[14] Galton, F. (1886). *Regression towards mediocrity in hereditary stature. Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, 15 : 246-263.*

[15] Ghosh, D. and Chinnaiyan, A. (2002) *Mixture modelling of gene expression data from microarray experiments. Bioinformatics 18, 275-286.*

[16] Gibbons, J.D., Olkin, I. and Sobel, M. (1977). *Selecting and Ordering Populations: A New Statistical Methodology. John Wiley and Sous, New York.*

[17] Gupta, S. S., and Panchapakesan, S. (1977). *Multiple Decision Procedures: Theory and Methodology of Selecting and Ranking Populations. Wiley, New York.*

[18] Hall, M.A. (1998). *Correlation based feature selection for machine learning. Phd thesis, Department of Computer-Science, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New-Zealand*

[19] Isserlis, L. (1918). *On a formula for the product-moment coefficient of any order of a normal frequency distribution in any number of variables. Biometrika 12: 134-139.*

[20] Knowles, D. and Ghahramani, Z. (2011). *Nonparametric Bayesian sparse factor models with application to gene expression modeling. Annals of Applied Statistics, 5:B 1534-1552, 2011.*

[21] Levy, K. J. (1975) *Selecting the best population from among k binomial populations or the population with the largest correlation coefficient from among k bivariate normal populations.Psychometrika,40, 121-122.*

[22] Levy, K. J. (1977). *Appropriate sample sizes for selecting a population with the largest correlation coefficient from amongk bivariate normal populations.Educational and Psychological Measurement,37, 61-66.*

[23] Parmigiani, G., Garret, E., Irizarry, R. and Seger, S. (2003). *The analysis of gene expression data: methods and software. NY: Springer.*

[24] Pearson, K. (1895). *Notes on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, 58 : 240-242.*

[25] Ramberg, J. S. (1977). *Selecting the best predictor variate. Commun. Statist., AS (11), 1133-1147.*

[26] Rizvi, M. H. and Solomon, H. (1973). *Selection of largest multiple correlation coefficients: asymptotic case. 7. Amer. Statist. Assoc. (68) 184-188.*

[27] Speed, T. P. (2003). *Statistical Analysis of Gene Expression Microarray Data. CRC Press.*

[28] Wilcox, R.R., (1978). *Some comments on selecting the best of several Binomial populations or the bivariate normal population having the largest correlation coefficient. Psychometrika, 43, 127-128.*

[29] Yeung, K., Fraley, C., Murua, A., Raftery, A. and Ruzzo, W. (2001a). *Model-based clustering and data transformations for gene expression data. Bioinformatics 17:977-987.*

[30] Yu, L. and Liu, H. (2003). *Feature selection for high-dimensional data: A fast correlation-based filter solution. In Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2003).*

[31] Zuk, O., Ein-Dor, L. and Domany, E. (2007). *Ranking under uncertainty. UAI, pages 466-473.*

Appendix

```
#Calling Packages:
#==================
library("psych", lib.loc="~/R/win-library/3.1")

#====================
#Functions Definition
#====================
TKL1<-function(x,h)
{
l<-length(x)
x1<-t(rbind(x,seq(1:l)))
x1<-x1[order(x1[,1],x1[,2],decreasing=TRUE),]

return(length(intersect(x1[1:h,2],seq(from=1,to=h,by=1)))/h)
}

TKL2<-function(x,y,K)
{
l<-length(x)
x1<-t(rbind(x,seq(1:l)))
x1<-x1[order(x1[,1],x1[,2],decreasing=TRUE),]

y1<-t(rbind(y,seq(1:l)))
y1<-y1[order(y1[,1],y1[,2],decreasing=TRUE),]

return(length(intersect(x1[1:K,2],y1[1:K,2]))/K)
}


#=============================================================
#Direct vs. Approximated Approach (Estimated sig_q)
#=============================================================
```

```
N=20000      #Number of genes
alpha=0.005 #Proportion of the genes that are correlated with Y
u<-alpha*N
K<-seq(from=300, to=1000, by=100)
l<-length(K)
m<-NA
tkl<-NA
U<-N-u
beta<-c(rep(1,times=u),rep(0,times=U))
c1<-NA
f1<-NA
v2<-NA

#approximated model
draw<-NA
empiric<-NA
p<-NA
sig_q<-NA
tkl2<-NA
c<-NA
f<-NA
r<-NA
v<-NA

for(t in 1:l)
{
k<-K[t]-1
for(i in 1:10)
{
x<-rnorm(n=N)
y<-sum(x[1:u])
c<-NA

for(j in 1:k)
{
z<-rnorm(n=N)
x<-rbind(x,z)
y=rbind(y,sum(z[1:u]))
}
for(j in 1:N)
```

```
{
r<-cor(x[,j],y)
c[j]<-fisherz(r)
c1[j]<-abs(r)
}
p=sqrt(1/(K[t]-3))
sig_q<-sqrt(var(c)-p^2)
draw<-rnorm(n=N, mean = 0, sd = sig_q)
empiric<-abs(draw+rnorm(n=N,mean=0,sd=p))
draw<-abs(draw)
f[i]<-TKL2(draw,empiric,u)

f1[i]<-TKL(c1,u)
}
tkl[t]<-mean(f1)
v[t]<-sd(f1)
tkl2[t]<-mean(f)
v2[t]<-sd(f)
}

plot(tkl~K,type='l',col='blue',xlab='Sample-Size',ylab='Proportion
lines(tkl2~K,type='b',col='red')
lines(tkl2[1:20]~K,type='l',col='red')
lines(tkl22[1:20]~K,type='b',col='green')
lines(tkl22[1:20]~K,type='l',col='green')

#=================
#Histogram+QQ-plot
#=================

#u=100

N=20000      #Number of genea
alpha=0.005 #Proportion of the genes that are correlated with Y
u<-alpha*N
K<-seq(from=30, to=600, by=30)
l<-length(K)
c<-NA
f<-NA
m<-NA
```

```
tkl<-NA
U<-N-u
beta<-c(rep(1,times=u),rep(0,times=U))

t=2

k<-K[t]-1
x<-rnorm(n=N)
y<-sum(x[1:u])
c<-NA

for(j in 1:k)
{
z<-rnorm(n=N)
x<-rbind(x,z)
y=rbind(y,sum(z[1:u]))
}
for(j in 1:N)
{
c[j]<-fisherz(cor(x[,j],y))
}
par(mfrow=c(1,2))
hist(c,xlab='Fisher-Z')
qqnorm(c)


#u=200


N=20000     #Number of genea
alpha=0.01 #Proportion of the genes that are correlated with Y
u<-alpha*N
K<-seq(from=30, to=600, by=30)
l<-length(K)
c<-NA
f<-NA
m<-NA
tkl<-NA
U<-N-u
beta<-c(rep(1,times=u),rep(0,times=U))
```

```
t=2

k<-K[t]-1
x<-rnorm(n=N)
y<-sum(x[1:u])
c<-NA

for(j in 1:k)
{
z<-rnorm(n=N)
x<-rbind(x,z)
y=rbind(y,sum(z[1:u]))
}
for(j in 1:N)
{
c[j]<-fisherz(cor(x[,j],y))
}
par(mfrow=c(1,2))
hist(c,xlab='Fisher-Z')
qqnorm(c)
```